

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JEFFREY HALL,

Defendant and Appellant.

A155531

(Solano County Super. Ct.
No. VCR 223223)

Defendant Jeffrey Hall appeals from the trial court's order extending his probation for an additional year. Hall's appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), identifying no issues and requesting that this court review the record and determine whether any arguable issue exists on appeal. Having done so, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

In November 2010, an FBI agent signed into a file sharing website and was able to download multiple images and videos from a user later identified as Hall, including approximately 35 images depicting violent child pornography. A subsequent search of Hall's residence disclosed 697 images and 325 videos of children engaged in sexual activity, posed in a sexually suggestive manner, showing their nude buttocks, and/or being spanked. Hall later admitted being involved in the possession and trafficking of child pornography between August 2010 and January 2011. Pursuant to a negotiated disposition, he pleaded guilty in June 2014 to one count of felony possession of child pornography for exhibition/distribution. (Pen. Code, § 311.2, subd. (c).) On July 30,

2014, the trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed Hall on formal probation for four years, subject to various terms and conditions, including that he serve 270 days in county jail, obey all reasonable instructions from his probation officer, refrain from viewing or possessing any pornography or other sexually explicit material, refrain from using electronic devices “for any purpose which might further sexual activity involving minor children,” and register as a sex offender under Penal Code section 290.

In July 2018, the probation department asked the court to extend Hall’s probation for an additional year, noting that Hall had not successfully completed sex offender treatment and there was concern regarding continuing deviant behavior based on some disclosures he made during a recent polygraph examination. On July 27, 2018—three days prior to the end of Hall’s original probationary period—the trial court summarily revoked probation so that jurisdiction could be maintained pending a hearing on the matter.

A subsequent report revealed Hall had admitted in early July 2018 that he continued to view pornography, that he “may have” viewed child pornography, and that he had viewed images of children being spanked in the “last couple of months.” Based on these disclosures, Hall’s treatment providers recommended continued treatment. A contested hearing was held on September 17, 2018. At the conclusion of the hearing, over defense objection, the trial court reinstated Hall’s probation, extending it for an additional year to July 30, 2019, under the same terms and conditions, with an express admonition that Hall comply with all treatment terms as directed by probation.

DISCUSSION

Hall appealed from the trial court’s September 2018 order reinstating and extending his probation. We appointed counsel to represent him in this matter. After examining the record, counsel filed a *Wende* brief raising no issues on appeal and requesting that we independently review the record. (*Anders, supra*, 386 U.S. 738; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Hall was advised by his attorney of the opportunity to file a supplemental brief with this court, but he has not done so. We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Hall’s attorney has complied with his responsibilities

and that no arguable issue exists. (See *People v. Leiva* (2013) 56 Cal.4th 498, 504–505 [under Penal Code section 1203.2 a court “is authorized to summarily revoke a defendant’s probation ‘ “if the interests of justice so require and the court . . . has reason to believe from the report of the probation officer or otherwise” that grounds for revocation exist’ ”]; *id.* at p. 505 [summary revocation tolls the probationary period until a formal hearing can be held]; see also *People v. Cookson* (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1091, 1095 [a court may modify a term of probation at any time, including extending the probationary term, based on changed circumstances]; *People v. Minor* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1, 11 [failure to complete sex offender treatment could constitute changed circumstances justifying extension of probation].)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

Sanchez, J.

WE CONCUR:

Humes, P. J.

Margulies, J.